UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/943,086 | 08/31/2001 | Alan Asay | 061047-0268225 | 8118 |
| 909 7590 06/03/2009 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN, LLP P.O. BOX 10500 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | CALLAHAN, PAUL E | |
| MCLEAN, VA 22102 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2437 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 06/03/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | 09/943,086 | ASAY ET AL. | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | PAUL CALLAHAN | 2437 | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication a Period for Reply | ppears on the cover sheet with | the correspondence address | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perion. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a repl od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cute, cause the application to become ABAN | TION. y be timely filed S from the mailing date of this communication. DONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). | |
| Status | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>04</u> | nis action is non-final. vance except for formal matter | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | |
| 4) | rawn from consideration. is/are rejected. | | |
| Application Papers | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Exami 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the | ccepted or b) objected to by ne drawing(s) be held in abeyance ection is required if the drawing(s) | . See 37 CFR 1.85(a). is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume 2. Certified copies of the priority docume 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority docume application from the International Bure * See the attached detailed Office action for a li | ents have been received. ents have been received in Appriority documents have been re eau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). | lication No ceived in this National Stage | |
| Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4-23-09. | Paper No(s)/I | nmary (PTO-413) /lail Date rmal Patent Application | |

Art Unit: 2437

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

- 1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5-4-09 has been entered.
- 2. Claims 1, 57-69, and 71-78 are pending and have been examined.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 5-4-09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant argues that Williams et al., US 5,815,657 may be distinguished from the claimed invention because Williams fails to teach the feature of transactional financial assurance with respect to an electronic infrastructure used in or with a transaction. The Applicant cites an illustrative non-limiting example of such in the form of an assurance regarding the accuracy or validity of an electronic certificate. However, the Examiner finds upon a review of Williams that such is taught at, for example, figure 5 and column 13 lines 40-53 where both merchant and consumer certificates are sent for verification as part of such a request messages.

Art Unit: 2437

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

- 5. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).
- 6. Claims 1, 57-61, 63-69, 71, 73, 74, and 76-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Williams et al., US 5,815,657.

As for claim 1, Williams et al. teaches a method of managing reliance in an electronic transaction system (Abstract) the method comprising: obtaining electronic signals representing subscriber assurance of an attribute of a subscriber to the system (fig. 29), the subscriber assurance issued by a certification authority hardware

Art Unit: 2437

mechanism (fig. 30, col. 11 lines 30-37, col. 36 lines 63-67, col. 37 lines 1-12): obtaining electronic signals representing a request for transactional financial assurance with respect to electronic infrastructure used in or with a transaction involving the subscriber (col. 13 line 40 through col. 14 line 23: the Payment Manager receives the request for transactional assurance (i.e., authorization to pay or payment) from the merchant, and receives certificate information from the user (user's wallet manager)); determining whether to provide the requested transactional assurance, based on at least the subscriber assurance (col. 13 line 40 through col. 14 line 23: the Payment Manager receives the request for transactional assurance (i.e., authorization to pay or payment) from the merchant, and receives certificate information from the user (user's wallet manager)); and, depending on the said determining, issuing electronic signals representing the requested transactional assurance to the relying party (fig. 34: Payment Window).

As for claim 57, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the subscriber assurance comprises (a) an identification assurance of the identity of the subscriber, or (b) an authorization assurance of authorization of the subscriber, or (c) both (a) and (b) (col. 13 line 41 through col. 14 line 6: Payment Manager receives a user certificate containing I.D. information).

As for claim 58, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the subscriber assurance comprises electronic signals representing a certificate (col. 13 line 41

Page 5

information).

As for claim 59, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the determining

is based also on information provided by the relying party (col. 13 line 41 through col. 14

line 6: Payment Manager receives a user certificate containing I.D. information and

certificate information from the Merchant).

As for claim 60, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the request for transactional assurance comes from the relying party (col. 13 lines 40-53: Merchant payment request also contains financial assurance information such as the merchant certificate sent to the payment manager).

As for claim 61, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the request for transactional assurance includes a request for a guarantee of an aspect of the transaction and comprising (col. 13 lines 40-50: Merchant sends transaction details and his certificate): validating information in the request for transaction financial assurance to determine whether to provide the guarantee for the aspect of the transaction (col. 16 lines 19-25: Merchant is verified); and sending electronic signals representing an indication of whether the aspect of the transaction will be guaranteed (col. 16 lines 19-25: a message is sent as to whether Merchant is verified or not, and therefore whether payment will be made of not).

Art Unit: 2437

As for claim 76, Williams teaches the method of claim 1, wherein the electronic infrastructure comprises electronic signals representing a certificate and the transactional financial assurance with respect to electronic infrastructure comprises an assurance selected from the following: assurance regarding the authenticity of the certificate, assurance regarding the accuracy of the certificate, or assurance regarding the validity of the certificate (fig. 5, col. 13 lines 40-53).

Claims 63-69, 71, 73, 74, 77, and 78 are directed towards a computer program that directs a computer to carry out the method steps of claims 1 and 57-61. Claims 63-75 contain substantially the same limitations as claims 1 and 57-62. Therefore claims 63-75 are rejected on the same basis as claims 1 and 57-61.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 62, 72, and 75 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following US Patents teach systems incorporating transactional financial assurance request messages pertinent to the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 2437

Rosen 5,621,797

Claxton et al. 7,177,839

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul E. Callahan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3869. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9 to 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Emmanuel Moise, can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is: (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Paul Callahan/ Art Unit 2437

/Emmanuel L. Moise/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437